

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/683,762

Applicant(s)

LACEY, HERBERT LYVIRN

Examiner

Nabil M El-Hady

Art Unit

2154

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nabil M El-Hady.

(3)_____.

(2) Phillip D. Mancini.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 22 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,6,7,11, and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: agreement is reached to amend independent claims 1, 6, and 11 to incorporate dependent claim features (in claims 2; 7, and 12, respectively) in order to place the application in condition for allowance.

During telephone conferences, Examiner stated that the patentable feature of the invention was that, unlike in the prior art of record, whether the data in the data buffer constitutes a complete message is determined not by looking just at the current frame, but rather by concatenating a subsequently received frame to already received frames in the data buffer and determining after concatenating and based on the concatenated data if the data in the buffer constitutes a complete message. The Examiner stated that this distinction was already present in dependent claims 2, 7 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant has amended each of the independent claims to specify concatenating the information contained within the next message frame onto the data within the data buffer, and determining, based on the concatenated data, whether the data in the data buffer constitutes a complete message.